

Now viewing document 4 (19478) of 134 in Search: |BP witness...

CUNNINGHAM

<b>Company</b>	BPXP
<b>Box No</b>	MDL2179VOL000001
<b>Custodian</b>	Internal Investigation Team - Source Docs
<b>Beg Doc No</b>	<b>BP-HZN-BLY00061251</b>
<b>End Doc No</b>	BP-HZN-BLY00061251
<b>DocID</b>	BP-HZN-BLY00061251
<b>Page Count</b>	1
<b>ParentID</b>	
<b>Attachment</b>	
<b>Family</b>	BP-HZN-BLY00061251-BP-HZN-BLY00061251
<b>Properties</b>	Standalone
<b>From</b>	Fontenot
<b>To</b>	
<b>CC</b>	
<b>BCC</b>	
<b>Subject</b>	
<b>Doc Date</b>	
<b>TimeSent</b>	
<b>Date Created</b>	05/09/2010
<b>Date Last Modified</b>	07/26/2010
<b>Date Received</b>	08/25/2010
<b>File Size</b>	32256
<b>Attachment Title</b>	Cunningham, Erick.xls
<b>Application</b>	Microsoft Excel
<b>File Path</b>	\\2010-0544\Marshall Maestri\InternalInvestigationSharePoint\Interviews and Witness Statements\BP\Cunningham, Erick\Cunningham, Erick.xls
<b>Doc Link</b>	<b>BP-HZN-BLY00061251.xls</b>
<b>Page Count TOF</b>	
<b>Folder ID</b>	
<b>Full Text</b>	<p>Erick Cunningham  5/9/2010 @ 11:30 - 1:00  Westlake  Interviewers: Kevin Fontenot, Kent Corser, Warren Winters  Started with BP 10/12/2009  role: technical role, support PSCM, support supplier management, create training programs, working segment recommended practice GP-?  Reports to Martin Varco (not in STS)  Current main focus is new rig coming - Ascension &amp; Clarion  Attend 2 meetings in regards to cementing Horizon - March 23rd 2pm &amp; April 14th @ 8:30am  March 23rd meeting  Attendees: Brian Morel, Mark Hafle, Jesse Gagliano  Topic of Mtg: Long String, weren't sure if they were going to get 7" or 7 5/8"  Big question was where they could get TOC circulating  Came into the meeting and Jesse had OptiCem running  Challenged the foam application usage and the complexity of the job  During this meeting the un-foamed cement was feasible and a better option in his option  No decision point in the meeting, it was all discussion</p>

EXHIBIT #	16
WIT:	

Discussion between Jesse and Brian about getting the well conditions correct  
 After the meeting the team learned more details around the well fracture issues  
 April 14th 8:30 Meeting  
 Attendees: Erick Cunningham, Mark Hafle, Brian Morel, Jesse Gagliano, Greg Walz, +1 unknown name  
 Topic of Meeting: Request to review ECD modeling  
 Decision had been made to use foam and a 9 7/8" X 7" long string  
 Question was could they circulate foam in place  
 targeted TOC thought it was 1000' as per GDP-1060  
 Concerns about Frac gradients and Pore Pressure and what was the most representative scenario  
 Jesse was running OptiCem and they were making inputs to the model  
 Erick was not previously informed of the foamed slurry design  
 OptiCem indicated they could place cement successfully  
 Meeting ended and decision was to develop a documents for presentation to decision makers  
 Also development of decision tree  
 Erick commented he had never seen decision tree until yesterday(5/9/2010)  
 Conceptionally overall the job looked reasonable no big red flags  
 They brought me in to look at the ECD model not how to cement it  
 Looking at only one decision point "can we circulate cement"  
 Did not see Halliburton design documents until post incident  
 Received some documents (lab results, DIMS report, post job report but did not get design report) from Jesse on April 26th in preparation for the MMS meeting  
 Ask Jesse for the final design report he received on 5/3/2010  
 Not sure if he has design report from the 15th  
 Two power point presentations one April 13 (liner option) and one April 14 (long string option)  
 Commented that it was a good decision to make the wiper trip because the team would learn a lot on the final wiper trip  
 Was not asked to review the MOC for the cement/long string  
 Never been in an MOC with BP  
 Did not give GOM any formal response back from meetings nor was he ask for a written response  
 Never talked about centralization placement  
 After the job asked Jesse "did you see anything wrong with the job" answer "no, except not running the additional centralizers"  
 Reviewed April 18th report and advised interview team on his option of results and terminology.

**Hash**

8596e913fa1cfba31001c9a2a36ee2f2

**Edit Tracking**

**Sticky Notes**

**Search Terms**

**Redacted**

**HCFolder**

Erick Cunningham  
5/9/2010 @ 11:30 - 1:00  
Westlake

Interviewers: Kevin Fontenot, Kent Corser, Warren Winters

Started with BP 10/12/2009

role: technical role, support PSCM, support supplier management, create training programs, working segment recommended practice GP-?

Reports to Martin Varco (not in STS)

Current main focus is new rig coming - Ascension & Clarion

Attend 2 meetings in regards to cementing Horizon - March 23rd 2pm & April 14th @ 8:30am

March 23rd meeting

Attendees: Brian Morel, Mark Hafle, Jesse Gagliano

Topic of Mtg: Long String, weren't sure if they were going to get 7" or 7 5/8"

Big question was where they could get TOC circulating

Came into the meeting and Jesse had OptiCem running

Challenged the foam application usage and the complexity of the job

During this meeting the un-foamed cement was feasible and a better option in his opinion

No decision point in the meeting, it was all discussion

Discussion between Jesse and Brian about getting the well conditions correct

After the meeting the team learned more details around the well fracture issues

April 14th 8:30 Meeting

Attendees: Erick Cunningham, Mark Hafle, Brian Morel, Jesse Gagliano, Greg Walz, +1 unknown name

Topic of Meeting: Request to review ECD modeling

Decision had been made to use foam and a 9 7/8" X 7" long string

Question was could they circulate foam in place

targeted TOC thought it was 1000' as per GDP-1060

Concerns about Frac gradients and Pore Pressure and what was the most representative scenario

Jesse was running OptiCem and they were making inputs to the model

Erick was not previously informed of the foamed slurry design

OptiCem indicated they could place cement successfully

Meeting ended and decision was to develop a documents for presentation to decision makers

Also development of decision tree

Erick commented he had never seen decision tree until yesterday(5/9/2010)

Conceptually overall the job looked reasonable no big red flags

They brought me in to look at the ECD model not how to cement it

Looking at only one decision point "can we circulate cement"

Did not see Halliburton design documents until post incident

Received some documents (lab results, DIMS report, post job report but did not get design report) from Jesse on April 26th in preparation for the MMS meeting

Ask Jesse for the final design report he received on 5/3/2010

Not sure if he has design report from the 15th

Two power point presentations one April 13 (liner option) and one April 14 (long string option)

Commented that it was a good decision to make the wiper trip because the team would learn a lot on the final wiper trip

Was not asked to review the MOC for the cement/long string

Never been in an MOC with BP

Did not give GOM any formal response back from meetings nor was he ask for a written response

Never talked about centralization placement

After the job asked Jesse "did you see anything wrong with the job" answer "no, except not running the additional centralizers"

Reviewed April 18th report and advised interview team on his option of results and terminology.



